1	MR. HAVENS: My companies are in
2	the bankruptcy, sir. May I say one thing?
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: They are?
4	MR. HAVENS: Yes, they are.
5	They're parties in the bankruptcy. Can I
6	address a few things briefly?
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, go ahead.
8	MR. HAVENS: Thank you.
9	The special entities are parties
10	in the bankruptcy. We have attorneys in the
11	bankruptcy. They have always been there.
12	They have reviewed the plan of reorganization,
13	the disclosure plan. We will be making
14	serious objections to both of them. We have
15	an alterative we will be offering to all of
16	the parties, including Maritime, in the
17	bankruptcy. We have comments that I could
18	make or I would have been happy to have our
19	attorneys make on all the arguments, which are
20	arguments, that Mr. Keller is making today.
21	I thought some minutes ago it was

decided to move on to the issue G, which is

certainly the finite purpose that Maritime 1 called this hearing, but --2 Maritime didn't 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: call any hearing. I called the hearing. It's 4 not a hearing. It's a conference. And I can 5 6 cover anything that I think is pertinent to getting the ball down the road a little bit or 7 do they kick the can now or what do they do? 8 MR. HAVENS: Yes, sir. I respect 9 I'm sorry. I probably misspoke. 10 that. Well, you have. JUDGE SIPPEL: 11 And you are wasting time. You can't even come 12 to Washington because you're so busy. And now 13 we're just wasting a bunch of time. 14 I respectfully have MR. HAVENS: 15 stated that my parties are part 16 of And we have rights in 17 bankruptcy. bankruptcy. And I stated some facts which I 18 think are relevant. 19 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, but then you 20 went into some other -- you know, you drifted 21 off of that. 22

Look, I am very much interested in 1 what is going on at the bankruptcy. And if 2 3 your attorneys down here are going to involve themselves in the hearing on June 13th and 4 5 there are going to be counter-proposals justiciable 6 offered and you have got a interest that the bankruptcy court has to 7 listen to, of course, I am very interested in 8 9 that. But I don't know why you don't 10 have a lawyer. I don't know why you don't 11 12 have a lawyer up here in the courtroom today 13 talking about this business, instead of you doing it on speakerphone when you've got 18 14 other things to do down there, out there, 15 16 wherever you are, California. That's a long 17 way off. MR. HAVENS: Because the report on 18 bankruptcy status wouldn't have gotten into 19 20 this.

are valuations

on the issue

addition,

In

valuation, there

21

2.2

of

the

in

1	bankruptcy. Those were under protective
2	order. If the Enforcement Bureau or Your
3	Honor or other parties would like to see those
4	valuations submitted by experts we paid for on
5	the Maritime licenses, then we could make an
6	appropriate arrangement.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you know
8	anything about that?
9	MS. KANE: We have not heard
10	anything about that. And I thought we were
11	entitled to all of the information that was
12	being filed in the bankruptcy court because
13	their protective order is the same as ours.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you know
15	something about this, Mr. Keller?
16	MR. KELLER: I'm not sure.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: The gentleman, Mr.
18	
19	MR. KELLER: Mr. Reardon knows
20	something about this. And I stated this.
21	This is not testimony, but he has some
22	information about the bankruptcy proceeding,

1	both in his capacity as manager and also as
2	having testified in the hearings and being
3	involved in the hearings that are coming up.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is status
5	information. I know you have a continuing
6	objection to this.
7	MS. KANE: We do have a continuing
8	objection to having Mr. Reardon
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: He's not
10	testifying.
11	MS. KANE: We understand that he
12	is providing information. We have not gotten
13	complete discovery or the opportunity to be
14	able to depose him on any of these issues. So
15	we just have
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: You will have the
17	opportunity to depose him.
18	MS. KANE: We hope to, Your Honor,
19	if we could ever get complete discovery from
20	Maritime.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Consider this part
22	of your discovery. I know you've got to get

1	more, but I'm saying that this is exactly
2	right. Anything that he says that's
3	inconsistent with what he says in a deposition
4	is not in his interest. So, you know, I don't
5	see Reardon as
6	MS. KANE: We understand that,
7	Your Honor. We just want to note our
8	objection for the record that
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
10	MS. KANE: it is inappropriate
11	for him to provide any sort of
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Okay. I've
13	got the objection. You're not under oath.
14	You're simply talking about what is going on
15	down there. Where is it being done?
16	Mississippi or somewhere?
17	MR. REARDON: It's in Aberdeen,
18	Mississippi, Your Honor, in the northern
19	district of Mississippi, in federal court
20	there.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
22	MR. REARDON: I testified on two

1	occasions. It's a matter of public record.
2	There is a transcript available on both
3	occasions. I testified about the value of the
4	licenses involved in the transactions in the
5	asset purchase agreements, which were brought
6	before Judge Houston in the bankruptcy court
7	for his approval.
8	There are two occasions: in
9	December and in January. I testified, of
10	course, under oath. And the judge does care
11	a lot about valuation. I was on the stand for
12	a number of hours discussing valuation.
13	At the hearing in January, Mr.
14	Havens also testified personally about
15	valuation. The judge listened to the
16	testimony on both occasions. And in a number
17	of instances, the court granted the assumption
18	of these asset purchase agreements that are
19	involved in, for example
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: When you say he
21	granted the assumption, what do you
22	MR. REARDON: By the debtor, by

MCLM, the debt by the bankruptcy estate. other words, we filed for approval of the asset purchase agreements in bankruptcy that And all of these different were pending. entities that were involved in this case with the exception of Wisconsin Power and Light, Interstate Power and Light, and DCP Midstream have all asked to have the court approve the assumption of their contracts. order to do that, Ι So in testified at the bankruptcy court that these

testified at the bankruptcy court that these were fair value contracts. And the court agreed in every situation except I believe Encana Oil and Gas and in Duquesne, where the judge asked for more information. And that was in response to Mr. Havens' testimony on the same subject.

MR. HAVENS: Mr. Reardon --

MR. REARDON: This is all public matter. This is all public record, Your Honor. But my point is that the court does care about valuation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But we have not had a hearing 1 since the reorganization plan was filed April 2 That hearing will come up the middle of 3 June, on the 13th. I will be there in person 4 also to testify about valuation. 5 would like HAVENS: Ι MR. 6 correct Mr. Reardon. There are no transcripts 7 yet. My companies are doing everything we can 8 to pay to get the transcripts. 9 And as far as the valuations, what 10 I stated is that we hired an independent 11 expert to do evaluations of the Maritime 12 system response to Mr. Reardon's own testimony 13 for his company without an expert. And what 14 I stated is those are available. 15 The Commission is a party in the 16 bankruptcy. But, in any case, I have always 17 said in this hearing before Your Honor that 18 anything my companies can do to provide useful 19 information, as Ms. Kane knows, we are quite 20 21 active in attempting to do that.

So in terms of this valuation to

the degree any party in the hearing or Your 1 information from the Honor would like 2 transcripts once we get that or the valuation 3 that we paid an independent expert to come up 4 with, we would be happy to provide that. 5 And, again, the FCC is a party in 6 7 the bankruptcy. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'll let Ms. 8 9 Kane decide, make the decision on that, whether or not they are going to go after 10 information from you, but I appreciate you 11 12 bringing it up. And that's it. 13 Thank you, Mr. Reardon. REARDON: Thank you, Your 14 MR. Honor. 15 JUDGE SIPPEL: That helps bring us 16 up to speed. It tells me, though, that there 17 is really nothing to decide on. Well, I am 18 not talking about making a "decision," but 19 there is nothing really to resolve this 20 question of bankruptcy or to put any kind of 21 22 a lid on it until after the hearing.

1	We need some kind of a final order
2	from the bankruptcy court. Otherwise we're
3	not going to understand what is going on.
4	Nobody has been able to give me an explanation
5	of what is going on, really. I mean, Mr.
6	Reardon told me what he testified to, and I
7	believe that. And I believe everything, but
8	anyway, that's got nothing to do with
9	anything else about the what about these
10	stipulations?
11	MR. KELLER: Well, Your Honor,
12	part of the issue here is the Bureau has been
13	complaining that we haven't complied with
14	discovery.
15	As I understand it, as far as the
16	Bureau's outstanding motions and all of that,
17	they are really only concerned with or they
18	are only raising issues as to four of the
19	interrogatories.
20	In the order that you put out
21	about this hearing, you made two statements
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's a conference.

Don't be calling it a hearing.

MR. KELLER: This conference. There are two statements that sort of concerned me. I remember you said something about you are entitled to know, at a minimum, whether the facilities are constructed and whether they are still in operation. And we don't have either. I take strong issue with that.

Maritime has provided unequivocal answers stating that each of the facilities was timely constructed. We where we have the specific information available have provided the dates that we believe the construction was completed.

There are situations in which we do not know the precise date precisely because of the time. I mean, most of these stations were constructed 15, 20 years or more ago, long before Maritime was ever around. But we do have reason to believe and as well as prior Commission adjudications to the effect that

they were timely constructed. 1 In that, the question about 2 whether they were constructed and then they 3 were constructed, as far as I understand, is 4 of the issue that the longer part 5 no 6 Commission is seeking to compel on. As far as operations, there have 7 been some disagreements with the Bureau over 8 wording and this, that, and the other, but we 9 believe that we have provided substantially 10 all of the information we can at this time 11 regarding operation of the facilities. 12 some documents here, 13 I've got including the proposed stipulations, which 14 I've got enough copies for the people here. 15 I would like to distribute, if I may. 16 Well, if you get JUDGE SIPPEL: 17 something agreed to by the Bureau and signed 18 by both parties, then I will take a look at 19 20 it. Well, let me do it MR. KELLER: 21 First of all, I guess I will start 22 this way.

by saying what I just said about construction. 1 I mean, we have answered the questions as to 2 construction. The Bureau maybe isn't 3 satisfied with the answers, but we have 4 answered the questions about construction. 5 With respect to the operational 6 facilities, we have also 7 of the status provided substantial information on that. And 8 basically it comes down to this. Each of the 9 facilities can be categorized into issues 10 performed. 11 outline This is the of the 12 stipulations that I am proposing. First of 13 all, Maritime has argued in the past all of 14 the stations that are subsumed within its 15 geographic licenses, these are all incumbent 16 Many of them are 17 or site-based licenses. subsumed within the geographic licenses that 18 were in the auction. And we pointed out that 19 this issue is sort of moot as to those. 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: Would you explain 21

that concept?

MR. KELLER: Well, it's because when you have a license, whenever the Commission has a geographic auction for geographic licenses, it includes a block of channels over a large geographic area.

There may be other licensees who already have what we call incumbent or site-based licenses in those areas. When the auction is held, the person bidding knows that and bids accordingly because these may be incumbent upon its licenses. If it gets the license, it is obliged to protect those incumbent licenses from interference. So you get a license that sort of looks like a piece of Swiss cheese, if you will.

If anything happens to those licenses in the meantime, if they expire, volume, or whatever, they go away, the holes in your Swiss cheese go in.

So what we have said is as to what

I am calling the subsumed licenses, when

Maritime bid in the auction, it already had

certain incumbent licenses. When it ran the auction, it got the larger geographic area.

What I am saying is on the basic qualifying issue, the one we were just talking about of second Thursday, one of two things is happen. Maritime is either going to eventually going to prevail, either because it gets second Thursday treatment or it goes through a hearing and wins or whatever, in which case it will only have the authority incumbent represented by these that is licenses.

whether the Ιt won't matter licenses get canceled or not because canceling authority will subtract the licenses no whatsoever from Maritime's geographic license. If, on the other hand, Maritime is found to be unqualified and all of its licenses revoked, that will include its incumbent licenses.

So either way you slice it, whatever happens under issue G -- and all we have argued in the past is that because it is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	a moot point, we ought not be required to go
2	to unreasonable lengths to go out and verify
3	the status of the facility.
4	But, having said that, we offered
5	early on basically Maritime is willing to
6	cut the issues in this hearing in half. It is
7	unilaterally doing so because we are going to
8	voluntarily cancel. We are in the process of
9	voluntarily canceling those licenses. We
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is there a business
11	reason for doing that?
12	MR. KELLER: Yes because it's not
13	worth spending time in a hearing litigating
14	over issues that are irrelevant or that are
15	not relevant. Maritime loses absolutely no
16	authority in doing so.
17	MR. HAVENS: They are relevant,
18	but if I am allowed, at a certain point, Your
19	Honor, I'd like to
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I want to get
21	Mr. Keller's report.
22	MR. KELLER: So that's number one.

Maritime will cancel those licenses. We put 1 this in our stipulation with the Bureau. The 2 Bureau came back with a stipulation. Their 3 counter-proposal was that Maritime would 4 automatically 5 stipulate these licenses canceled for permanent discontinuance 6 operations or something to that effect. 7 We're not saying that. We're not 8 willing to say that. But what we are saying 9 is that we are voluntarily canceling those 10 have already submitted 11 licenses, some 12 applications to do so in those cases. is one case where we procedurally can't submit 13 14 the application yet. But that will cut in half -- if 15 you look at all of the list of licenses 16 involved in this hearing --17 JUDGE SIPPEL: Isn't it 130? 18 Well, actually, the MR. KELLER: 19 way you really have to break it down is by 20 21 each location and each frequency block.

I don't remember what the exact count is when

you come down to that, but what I can tell you 1 that if you subtract out all of the 2 subsumed licenses, the ones we're cashing in, 3 that takes away half of the cases right there. 4 That takes away half of them. 5 Okay? Of the remaining half that are 6 still at issue, these are licenses that are 7 These are licenses that are 8 not subsumed. totally outside of Maritime's geographic 9 So they have independent authority 10 standing alone. 11 As to those licenses, what we are 12 prepared to do is we are willing to stipulate 13 to which of those licenses are 14 currently operating in the sense of providing 15 16 service. We are prepared to stipulate that as to most of these licenses, Maritime has not 17 provided AMTS service on these facilities 18 since December of 2007. 19 So how does the JUDGE SIPPEL: 20 Bureau know that those have been constructed? 21

KELLER:

Well,

we

22

MR.

have

answered in discovery. As I said, they have 1 been discovered. Obviously at the hearing, 2 the Commission can take issue with that, but 3 4 we --JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait a minute. 5 Wait a minute. How do you take issue with 6 something that is either constructed or it is 7 8 not constructed? 9 MR. KELLER: Well, we --JUDGE SIPPEL: What is the issue? 10 The Commission has MR. KELLER: 11 12 asked, were the facilities constructed? JUDGE SIPPEL: 13 Yes. MR. KELLER: We said yes, that 14 they were all timely constructed. We have 15 16 produced 27,000-plus pages of documents showing operations of the company. We have 17 provided revenue information, this, that, and 18 In some cases where we have the 19 the other. information, we have provided the construction 2.0 licensee 21 notifications that the prior

submitted to the Commission at the time of

1	construction.
2	In many of these cases, there have
3	been multiple prior rulings by the Commission.
4	There have been litigations, petitions to
5	deny, the rules, many things, by Mr. Havens,
6	`as a matter of fact,
7	MR. HAVENS: I disagree.
8	MR. KELLER: where the
9	Commission has issued rulings
10	MR. HAVENS: I disagree with your
11	representation that there have been
12	adjudications that these
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Havens, this
14	isn't the way it works. Okay? Just be quiet.
15	MR. KELLER: So all I'm saying is
16	there has been information. We have answered
17	that they are constructed. We have answered
18	to the extent that we can verify the dates
19	when they were constructed. We have stated
20	that they were all timely constructed.
21	Now, we have provided whatever
22	information we have on that in discovery. The

Bureau has the burden in the proceeding of proof. If the Bureau believes that our information is inaccurate or whatever, I'm sure we will hear about it at the hearing. But the Bureau is the one that has to come forward with the information and prove that these stations were not constructed. But that's number one.

Number two, we have stated in our hearing that these were all timely constructed. And we also stated that they were operated up until some point after 2005-2006.

As of December of 2007, no AMTS service was provided. We received no further revenue. The company did not provide AMTS service as to most of these licenses. We are willing to stipulate to that.

We are not willing to stipulate that the discontinuance of service is permanent. Okay? As to some of the facilities, we are also willing -- as to most

of the facilities, we are also willing to
stipulate that service has not since resumed
at this point. Some of them maybe have
resumed or we believe they have because we
believe that in some cases, the company
resumes service by providing leases, spectrum
leases, pursuant to the Commission's secondary
market rules. But as to most of them, we are
willing to stipulate that the service hasn't
resumed. So right there the Commission
we're stipulated that since 2007 or we will
stipulate that since 2007, no service has been
provided. But we still believe the Commission
has the burden of proving that that
discontinuance is permanent.
The company has taken the position
that it has never intended to permanently
discontinue service. We
MS. KANE: Your Honor?
JUDGE SIPPEL: Let him finish.
MR. KELLER: We also are prepared
to stipulate as to I don't know maybe

close to 10 to 20 or so stations that are not only not providing service but are not operational at a certain date for one reason or another. We lost the power or utilities have been canceled for nonpayment. So the station can't operate.

So basically what I am saying is in discovery, we have provided the information about each facility whether we -- first of all, we have unequivocally stated that everything was timely constructed.

to operational Number two, as status, we have provided the information that the station is either operational or it is capable, constructed, and capable of providing service right now. We have provided information about whether or not it providing service right now. We have provided information about which stations are not operational and not capable of providing And we have provided information service. regarding the dates of when the stations

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	become nonoperational.
2	Now, if there is still something
3	missing, I mean, I don't know what it is.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me hear
5	from Ms. Kane.
6	MS. KANE: Well, let me see if I
7	can do this in somewhat of an organized
8	fashion. With regard to the construction
9	issues, we have asked for dates of
10	construction. And we asked for discovery on
11	whether there was evidence of construction.
12	We have asked Maritime to identify
13	that evidence by production number since all
14	of the evidence was numbered in their 27,000
15	pages.
16	In response, we got a chart that
17	identifies for a small portion of the licenses
18	a specific construction date and a few
19	documents that have production numbers. I
20	don't know the numbers off the top of my head,
21	but

JUDGE SIPPEL:

22

That's all right.